



TESTIMONY
OF THE
CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES
TO THE
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

February 9, 2009

CCM is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local governments - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 93% of Connecticut's population. We appreciate this opportunity to testify before this joint committee on issues of concern to towns and cities.

CCM supports the following bills:

SB 388	AN ACT DELAYING REVALUATION
SB 395	AN ACT DELAYING MUNICIPAL REVALUATION
HB 5545	AN ACT CONCERNING DEFERRAL OF REVALUATION BY MUNICIPALITIES
HB 5547	AN ACT CONCERNING THE REVALUATION PROCESS
HB 5551	AN ACT CONCERNING REVALUATION
HB 5562	AN ACT CONCERNING A MUNICIPAL OPTION TO CONDUCT A STATISTICAL REVALUATION FOR PURPOSES OF THE PROPERTY TAX
HB 5860	AN ACT AUTHORIZING MUNICIPALITIES TO DELAY REVALUATION
HB 5867	AN ACT CONCERNING POSTPONEMENT OF REVALUATION
HB 5874	AN ACT CONCERNING REVALUATION OF PROPERTY
HB 5879	AN ACT ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM ON REVALUATION
HB 6307	AN ACT ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM ON REVALUATION

These proposed bills all would offer towns and cities much-needed relief options from the local property revaluation process -- we urge the committee to combine, draft and favorably report them. S.B. 388 is the simplest and most comprehensive of the ones before you today.

CCM supports allowing municipalities the option to delay revaluations -- until the economy can rebound -- as a reasonable means to (a) provide savings from the cost of conducting revaluations, and (b) provide a measure of relief to hard-pressed local property taxpayers by delaying either implementation or phase-in of a revaluation. Precedent is there: a similar deferral was allowed during the economic slump in 2003.

The cost of conducting a property revaluation, as currently mandated, could cost a small town approximately \$220,000. Statewide -- this mandate could potentially postpone over \$3.2 million in revaluation costs for towns scheduled to conduct revaluations in 2009, and over \$6.2 million for those scheduled to conduct revaluations in 2010.

If municipalities that have conducted revaluations do not implement them -- then millions of dollars of property tax increases *will not shift* to residential property taxpayers. Now, that is tangible relief -- amidst uncertain fiscal times!

It is unclear how many municipalities would exercise such an option -- but in today's tough budget climate -- each community should be able to analyze how revaluation will affect it and the people who live and work there. They should have a choice.

When it comes to managing the local bottom-line in these difficult times -- local officials need (1) options for quick relief, and (2) the necessary discretion to make decisions that work best for their communities. Enabling towns and cities the discretion to delay conducting, implementing or phasing-in revaluations would provide their taxpayers and local budgets that much-needed temporary relief.

CCM urges the committee to combine these bills, draft and favorably report a bill that will allow municipalities to delay, for the course of the economic downturn, (i) implementation or phase-in of revaluations, and (ii) conducting of revaluations that are scheduled to be undertaken.



If you have any questions, please call Gian-Carl Casa, Ron Thomas, or Bob Labanara of CCM, at (203) 498-3000.

Attachment



**CONNECTICUT
CONFERENCE OF
MUNICIPALITIES**

900 Chapel St., 9th Floor, New Haven, Connecticut 06510-2807
Phone (203) 498-3000 • Fax (203) 662-6314 • www.ccm-ct.org

THE VOICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Town-by-Town Revaluation Schedule

2008 Revaluation Dates	
Municipality	Population
Avon	17,333
Barkhamsted	3,665
Bethany	5,566
Bethlehem	3,549
Bolton	5,116
Bridgeport	136,695
Bridgewater*	1,884
Burlington	9,143
Canton	10,086
Chaplin	2,528
Cheshire	28,833
Chester	3,834
Darien	20,246
East Granby	5,122
Essex	6,753
Franklin	1,891
Hampton	2,118
Harwinton	5,564
Kent	2,952
Lebanon	7,354
Litchfield	8,671
Lyme	2,076
Monroe	19,402
New Canaan	19,890
New Hartford	6,736
New London	25,923
Norfolk	1,652
Norwalk	83,456
Norwich	36,432
Old Saybrook	10,539
Putnam	9,292
Rocky Hill	18,808
Scotland	1,725
Sharon	3,022
Sherman	4,110
Suffield	15,104
Torrington	35,451
Union	751
Washington	3,671
Watertown	22,128
Weston	10,200
Wethersfield	25,781
Willington	6,139
Windsor	28,754
Windsor Locks	12,491
Woodbury	9,654

2009 Revaluation Dates	
Municipality	Population
Bloomfield	20,693
Branford	28,984
Brooklyn	7,886
Canterbury	5,100
Coventry	12,192
Mansfield	24,884
Morris	2,345
New Fairfield	14,100
Old Lyme	7,384
Pomfret	4,165
Somers	10,850
Sprague	2,981
Stratford	49,015
Thompson	9,231
Tolland	14,631
Woodbridge	9,201

2010 Revaluation Dates	
Municipality	Population
Clinton	13,578
Colebrook	1,529
Deep River	4,673
Derby	12,434
Durham	7,397
Ellington	14,426
Fairfield	57,548
Greenwich	61,871
Haddam	7,800
Hamden	57,698
Ledyard	15,097
Marlborough	6,351
Newington	29,619
New Milford	28,439
North Branford	14,406
North Haven	24,002
North Stonington	5,212
Orange	13,813
Oxford	12,527
Prospect	9,273
Salisbury	3,987
Seymour	16,240
Southington	42,142
Stafford	11,786
Trumbull	34,752
Voluntown	2,612
Wallingford	44,679
West Haven	52,676
Westport	26,508
Windham	23,678
Woodstock	8,188

*Developing waiver request

Source: Office of Policy Management, 2009

